



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

noble fairy, born of sunlight and crowned with stars', there is still some faint echo of the old love of beauty as an essential and practical thing, and not as something extra, which is the real secret of the superiority of ancient Greece to all succeeding peoples in literature and art. We owe a great debt to Professor Phoutrides for his fine poetical translation, which one reviewer, a professor of ancient Greek somewhat prejudiced against the Modern Greek language, says is superior to the original. In this volume we have only the First Half of Life Immovable (The Fatherlands, The Return, Fragments from the Song to the Sun, Verses of a Familiar Tune, The Palm Tree). Let us hope that Professor Phoutrides will soon issue the Second Half; and, as he is a poet himself as well as a scholar,—may he give us some day also versions of the best of the other Modern Greek poets.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY DAVID M. ROBINSON

Greek Life. Bibliography and Review Questions. New and Revised Edition. By F. W. Tilden. Bloomington, Indiana: University Book Store (1920).

This pamphlet contains comprehensive and helpful lists of books devoted to Greek Antiquities, Travel, Geography, Topography, Art, Archaeology, and Architecture. Review Questions on the Greek World, Ancient and Modern, and Greek Private Life, and Subjects for Themes are included. The titles here assembled should be of service to students and teachers of Greek life.

BARNARD COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LARUE VAN HOOK

Greek Literature in English. Bibliography, Questions on Prescribed Reading, Review Questions. By F. W. Tilden. New and Revised Edition. Bloomington, Indiana: University Book Store (1920).

In the first part of this little pamphlet the author gives bibliographies for works on Greek literature in general and also for some special periods and authors. The lists are good, on the whole, and the best books are generally given, so that the teacher who is giving a course in Greek Literature in English will find the bibliographies of convenience for himself and his students. The method followed by the compiler, however, seems to have been to make a list merely of the books pertaining to Greek literature which are found in the Indiana University Library (as a shelf number in parenthesis following each book indicates). In consequence, considerable out-of-date material is included, some recent books are missing, and late and revised editions of standard works are not always given. So e. g. only the *third* edition (1898) of Christ's *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* is cited. The complete omission of Lucian in such a course seems strange, indeed.

The second part of the pamphlet is devoted to Questions on the Prescribed Reading. These questions, generally speaking, seem altogether too detailed and often quite unimportant. They are concerned too much with the business of extracting the mere story from the student and not enough with the real meaning, ideas, and literary values of the masterpiece which has been read. General Review questions conclude the pamphlet.

For a new and revised edition the text is regretably full of misprints. Misspellings of proper names are very numerous.

BARNARD COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LARUE VAN HOOK

Concise Latin Grammar. By Benjamin L. D'Ooge. Boston: Ginn and Company (1921). Pp. xviii-410.

The announcement of a new work by Professor D'Ooge evokes the eager interest of practical teachers, because his name gives full confidence of sound scholarship, freedom from irritating individualism, and pedagogic worth. This new Latin Grammar is a welcome addition to the list of works associated with his name, and is not inferior, in these good qualities, to its predecessors.

Simplicity has been an especial aim in the preparation of this Grammar, but it has not been obtained by arbitrary or ill-guided selection. In accord with modern tendencies, a rather full account of word-formation is given (§§ 281-294). We note also a very short treatment of ablaut (56-57). The order of words, on the other hand, is discussed with unusual fulness and detail, and the rules are based on the most recent investigations (910-949).

Professor D'Ooge's thorough modernity, without radicalism, is illustrated in the nomenclature. As stated in the Preface (iii), "a conservative attitude has been taken, but such of the new terms have been adopted as seem likely to win general acceptance".

In several points, this book is more advanced than some of the larger Grammars. It is a pleasure to see the perfect passive participle given as the fourth principal part (212). The ablative of attendant circumstance and the ablative of accordance are recognized (457-458).

A partial correction is made of the perfect active subjunctive forms of the second person singular and first and second person plural, but unhappily only partial, for the mood-sign is marked as common in quantity (230, C, N.I., 234, A, 241, etc.). It is indisputably certain that the Romans themselves fairly often confused the forms of the perfect subjunctive and the future perfect indicative active. Yet in the subjunctive the correct quantity is long, in the indicative short. The Romans erred in each direction. If their aberration is to be recognized by the mark of quantitative uncertainty in the subjunctive, it should be similarly recognized in the indicative. Very few classes will say, very few teachers will even desire to have their classes say, '*rexerimus* or *rexerimus*, *rexeritis* or *rexeritis*'. The result will surely be that teachers who have themselves learned these forms incorrectly will permit, or direct, their classes to disregard the correct quantity. Thus the erroneous tradition will be perpetuated.

The treatment of the gerund and the gerundive is especially notable, as a model of clearness and conciseness, with sufficiently full practical directions (870-880).

In only one place do we observe a lack of clearness. In the treatment of indirect discourse, we read (887, I), "Principal clauses, when *declarative*, change the indicative to the infinitive with subject accusative". If the observant pupil ask, 'What if the verb was not indicative?', he will find no answer. Five pages further (page 332), under the special head of "Conditional Sentences in Indirect Discourse", the necessary rules are given. Nothing is finally omitted. But a simple note of reference, under the first statement, to the other would, we believe, be desirable for pupils using the book without the presence of a teacher.

Although this Grammar is intended to be "of equal service to the high-school pupil and to the college

undergraduate" (Preface, iii), it is obviously expected that either the College instructor or the College textbook will supplement it at some points. This is avowed in the case of the prosody, for, as declared in the Preface (iii-iv), only the meters used by Vergil and Ovid have been explained, on the ground that College text-books dealing with the lyric and the dramatic poets regularly explain their meters. The early Latin use of *cum* with the indicative, where Golden Latin employed the subjunctive, receives only a mention, so far as concerns *cum*-causal clauses (754, Note 2); of the late use of temporal conjunctions with the subjunctive in iterative sense, we do not find even mention, but at most only implication.

We do not believe that this Grammar will supersede Allen and Greenough, nor that it ought to. But pressure is a manifest fact in the work of the Latin teacher in many a School and College. For a statement of the 'minimum essentials', not as held by our rivals and opponents, but as practical Latinists will admit them, this book, in our judgment, is unsurpassed. Where Allen and Greenough is deemed too full, or too detailed, or too philological, the Concise Latin Grammar can be cordially recommended. We should prefer it, under these circumstances, to any other. That it will need a small amount of supplementing for College work is true. We should wish the College student to possess a fuller Grammar. Nevertheless, this Grammar can be used with satisfaction by the ordinary College student.

D'YONVILLE COLLEGE,
BUFFALO, NEW YORK

HENRY S. DAWSON

TRANSLATIONS OF ARISTOTLE'S POETICS

In a notice of Professor Gilbert Murray's Preface to Ingram Bywater's translation of the Poetics of Aristotle, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15. 39-40, Professor Knapp was good enough to mention my Amplified Version of the treatise. My book is no longer published by Messrs. Ginn and Company, but has a new lease of life through Messrs. Harcourt, Brace, and Company.

As it seems to me, Professor Murray overstates the difficulty of translating the Poetics—that is, once we know in a given case precisely what Aristotle means, and when we can be sure whether he is using a term like 'prologue' or 'discovery' or 'myth' in a loose and general, or in a stricter and more technical, sense. Bywater himself says (Aristotle on the Art of Poetry, viii), "The book, taken as it is, with perhaps an occasional side-light from some of his other works, is intelligible enough".

I agree, then, that sometimes, as Professor Murray says, "we must not attempt to draw very closely to the meanings of Greek words"; and I disagree by adding that, when we render the Poetics of Aristotle into a modern language, we must sometimes draw as closely to them as we can. Dr. Gudeman, in his German translation of the Poetics (Leipzig, Meiner, 1921), is often surprisingly true to the Greek with no sacrifice of the modern idiom; I heartily recommend this translation to the few Americans who occupy themselves in a scholarly way with the Poetics. And they may study with profit Dr. Gudeman's article, *Die Syrisch-Arabishe Uebersetzung der Aristotelischen Poetik*, in *Philologus* 76 (1920), 239-265. Here, and not in Professor Murray's Preface, is the newest light on Aristotle's theory of poetry. More light from the same source may be expected in the edition of the Poetics that Dr. Gudeman, in his translation, announces.

To return to Professor Murray, how can one say that in Aristotle's day "the only living form of drama was the New Comedy"? Aristotle was born B. C.

384. According to Professor R. G. Kent, in *The Classical Review* 20 (1906), 153-155, Aristophanes died B. C. 375 or later (when Aristotle was a boy nine or ten years old); his fame, however, did not die then. In B. C. 340-339, when Aristotle was at the height of his powers, there is indication of a revival of the earlier comedy on the Athenian stage (compare the inscription in *Urkunden Dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen*, edited by Adolf Wilhelm, page 27). Probabilities favor the notion that at least one play of Aristophanes was thus revived. In the *Didascalie*, Aristotle seems to have been preoccupied, as far as comedies are concerned, with the period of Aristophanes. And whenever his Poetics was written, as may be seen from the conjoint allusion there to Sophocles, Homer, and Aristophanes, the last-named was then regarded as the supreme figure among comic poets.

If there was any period of 'Middle' Comedy, Aristotle lived through that. But, Meineke and others to the contrary notwithstanding, there is no real evidence that his favorite among comic poets was Anaxandrides; I have gathered all the evidence, as I believe, on this and related points, and have reason to hope that my article on the subject will soon appear. Did the comic poet Anaxandrides produce a more living form of the drama than the tragic poet Theocritus, Aristotle's own pupil?

And what of the 'New' Comedy in our sense? Philemon began to exhibit plays at Athens about B. C. 330, and Menander in B. C. 322-321, a year or so after Aristotle left the city—doubtless after his death. It is reasonable to suppose that Aristotle had formed his notions of literary art before 330, and very unreasonable to think that he was influenced by the stripling Menander. He may very well have known Menander, who was a pupil of Aristotle's friend and pupil Theophrastus; and Menander may have learned something from the Poetics.

Is there no presumption in saying that Aristotle "misunderstands" the word *mythos*? I have seen it stated that in his day *mythos* was used for 'plot' in tragedy, and *logos* for 'plot' in comedy. He himself, when mentioning Crates's success in constructing comic plots, says that Crates made '*mythoi* and *logoi*'. Aristophanes uses *logos* to describe the substance of a comedy—and the comic poet Antiphanes, contemporary with Aristotle, applies *logos* to the tragic story of Oedipus or Alcmæon! We know too little of the terms used in Greek treatises on literary art and the like to assume that Aristotle misunderstood them; in the Poetics he refers perhaps thirteen times to other authorities or technical works in the same field. He seems to have been reasonably well-acquainted with what others had said and written on the subject; we can not be.

The utility of the Poetics to the student of modern literature is a subject too large and varied for discussion here. I have dealt with the question in my 'amplified' rendering. But on this point again, Professor Murray seems to be at odds with Bywater, who says that Aristotle "tells one, in fact, how to construct a good play and a good epic, just as in the Rhetoric he tells one how to make a good speech. And in so doing, he has succeeded in formulating once for all the first great principles of dramatic art, the canons of dramatic logic which even the most adventurous of modern dramatists can only at his peril forget or set at naught".

Let me add the following from Alfred Croiset (A. and M. Croiset, *Histoire de la Littérature Grecque* 4. 739-740: 'Of late, certain scholars, perhaps through a natural reaction against the former idolatry long accorded to the Poetics, have seemed to take pleasure in depreciating the work. This new exaggeration is not more reasonable than the other. The Poetics is a masterpiece, in which the fundamental traits of Greek